

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2865

remarks. It was my privilege to address the delegates on February 12 as follows:

COORDINATED HEALTH PROGRAMS

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, it is my privilege to have this opportunity to discuss briefly some experiences and ideas that have been put into effect in relation to coordination of public health programs. I speak as a private family doctor on this subject. The emphasis in the past has been upon acute diseases. During the past few decades preventative medicine has come to the fore and received its just consideration. With these two fields now approaching their proper perspective the field of chronic disease is being further evaluated in our country. Our aim has been to have coordinated health programs under local control, that is, the region, or State involved.

The combination of private endeavors both by qualified individuals and qualified organizations such as voluntary health bodies has been brought into the total program under the guidance and partnership of the governmental public health departments.

SOLUTIONS

1. Surveys

We consider the Federal or National Public Health Department as being the consultant. The State, or one might call it provincial health department, is the partner and the regional or county health department one might call the boss subject to the will of the people.

Surveys are encouraged on the local level utilizing fully the State and Federal public health agents to discover needs and overlaps of existing problems or services. It is obvious that surveys in different areas will vary due to differing economic factors such as mining areas or farming areas. Other variables are the dietary factors which lead to what Mr. Dubois called environmental. Many other variables such as industrial health and urban life problems could be elaborated. Further, there are geographical differences, and these make possible an emphasis on specific problems and diseases which might require specialized research. Again I refer to the problems of the coal miners with pneumoconiosis or farmers with problems of fungus infections. Thus we find the surveys differ in the needs and the emphasis that must be placed. There is a disease selectivity which varies with our areas depending on climate, and, therefore, no overall selection of needs covers each survey equally.

2. Selection of priority needs

Priority needs are determined through statistical findings of the area both as to environmental and communicable factors. If the major problem is receiving attention, then priority is placed upon other public health needs. Preventative medicine is emphasized in the survey. The list is then compiled according to importance and plans are made to attack the particular problems as economic and manpower factors will permit. Thus the survey in the selection of needs is tailored to the area involved.

3. Public and provincial education

The many obvious problems often are already apparent to the professional community. The solutions to some of the problems may entail pioneering of new procedures and new methods. To this extent it is necessary first, we find in our experience, to be sure that the professions (doctors of medicine, nurses, dentists, and paramedical associates) are fully aware of the planned solutions and have a part in determining it. Once this is concluded, then we proceed through modern public relations methods to inform the public by individual contact, organizational contacts, or exposure to newspaper, radio, and television information.

4. Coordination of efforts

The teamwork then begins between the private citizen as an individual, the voluntary bodies on an organizational basis and the public through public health governmental efforts.

5. Results

The teaming of the above factors of survey for determination of needs and overlaps, proper selection of priority needs, public and professional education, then consideration of efforts can result in success or failure. We have found out that these key factors entail local participation with motivation in conjunction with enlightened governmental aid. This system may be attacked but has proven to be a successful one and we as private citizens and governmental officials are working together to see that it is constantly improved.

CONCLUSIONS

It has been my purpose to present to you the team action that we have used in the United States not in criticism of other systems but only to tell you what has worked best with us and how we are constantly seeking to improve our public health. If all of us will lend of our experiences in the fields of science freely and openly to each other we will be able to mutually move forward. The challenge of the coming decades means accentuation of not only acute and preventive disease measures but the development of new solutions for chronic diseases and other public health problems. We use local motivation with proven needs for joint private efforts with enlightened Federal support without control.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to present some basic views on coordinated public health programs.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1962, the Trade Expansion Act became law. I voted against the bill. In my opinion it was a very bad bill. A number of us who voted against the bill felt that aside from the many bad provisions, that action if merited at all was premature. We contended that Congress could not intelligently deal with the question of the Common Market until we knew what countries would comprise the Common Market. Specifically we pointed out that it was not known whether or not Great Britain would be a Common Market member. We urged that the bill be allowed to go over to this year. "We were shouted down. The bill was passed and signed by the President.

Even though the bill contained mostly undesirable provisions as far as many of us were concerned, it did contain one good provision, that is, section 231. This section required that the products of Yugoslavia and Poland pay the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries. What could be more sensible than

that? Why should we treat the products of the Communist countries on the same favored basis as the products produced in the countries of the free world?

Let me read the precise language of section 231. It provides as follows:

The President shall, as soon as practicable, suspend, withdraw, or prevent the application of the reduction, elimination or continuance of any existing duty or other import restriction, or the continuance of any existing duty-free or excise treatment, proclaimed in carrying out any trade agreement under this title or under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism.

Please note that the provision states that the President shall deny most-favored-nation treatment to all Communist countries. Under the former law, which denied most-favored-nation treatment to countries which were members of the international Communist conspiracy, it was ruled that since Yugoslavia and Poland were so-called independent Communist countries that the products of these countries were entitled to most-favored-nation treatment or in other words reduced tariff rates. Therefore, recognizing this to be wrong, our able and most distinguished chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, proposed and his committee adopted this amendment which logically would require all Communist countries, including Yugoslavia and Poland, to have their products dutiable at the full duty rate.

Of course all of you know the difference between the full duty rate and the reduced duty rate. The full duty rates were those established by the Tariff Act of 1930, but those duty rates have been reduced on an average of 80 percent under our trade agreements program through international negotiations. These reduced duty rates are applicable to the products of all countries which are not members of the international Communist conspiracy.

There are two principles involved here which I believe run very deep. One is why should we treat any Communist country on the same favorable trading basis as countries of the free world? Does it serve to build our friendships in the free world if they know that Communist Yugoslavia and Poland receive the same tariff treatment as they receive?

Secondly, this country always has been the foundation for private enterprise, although in recent years many have attempted to shake and shatter this foundation. Under the private enterprise system costs are vital in determining selling prices. Under Communist governments the government may determine the price without regard as to whether a particular product is sold in the United States at a profit or whether it is sold at a loss. This makes the most unfair competition for American private enterprise. I can say that business and employees engaged in manufacturing in my district are being seriously injured by these unfair imports from Communist Yugoslavia.

I think every American owes a debt of gratitude to the chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, who is responsible for having had this amendment inserted. Although the amendment was taken out in the Senate Finance Committee, upon the urging of our State Department which frequently takes strange positions on many issues, the conference committee of the two Houses in its wisdom, restored this provision. It is true that the administration and specially the State Department vehemently objected to the amendment and pleaded with the conferees not to have it included. The conferees, of course, listened and considered these pleadings, but in the end decided that it should not be the policy of the United States to grant the same low tariff treatment to Communist Yugoslavia and Poland as is extended to the free countries of the world. You know the result. The conference report was adopted both by the House and the Senate and the President signed the bill. He could have vetoed it. If he had vetoed it on balance I am convinced he would have done a good thing for America. But he did not veto it. He elected to sign it, but he has not taken the action which this provision clearly requires him to take.

It is reported that the State Department contends that an 1882 treaty between the United States and Serbia requires that either country give the other country at least 1 year's notice before any tariff increase is established. Now first we all know that Serbia no longer exists. However, the geographical area which once was Serbia is now a part of Yugoslavia. It is questionable at best whether this 1882 treaty with Serbia is controlling, particularly in this case because the United States would not be raising its duty in the legalistic sense. We would be simply withdrawing most-favored-nation treatment which is a unilateral benefit which we have extended inasmuch as neither Yugoslavia nor Poland are members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. However, even if we were bound in this instance by this 1882 Serbian treaty, why does not the President give the 1-year notice which the administration contends is required? In any event it is not applicable in the case of Poland.

Let me emphasize, the law states that the President "shall" act "as soon as practicable." He has now had more than 6 months and to my knowledge he has done nothing to implement this provision of law and has not indicated that he is contemplating action. If there ever was a government of men rather than a government of law, this is it. Are we Members of Congress going to let the President openly flout the requirements of the statute? I say we should not and should not give the President any additional power until he acts in accordance with the provision of section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act and requires Yugoslavia and Poland to pay the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I was a member of the conference committee, and of course of the Committee on Ways and Means, which considered this amendment. There can be no question that the gentleman has stated accurately what transpired. The section in previous law was that it was determined that neither Yugoslavia nor Poland was a Communist nation. This amendment provided that a nation under Communist domination in effect was a part of the international Communist conspiracy and should not be accorded most-favored-nation treatment. That made it clear beyond any peradventure of a doubt.

After this amendment was adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means and this body the other body reached its position and the matter went to conference. The managers on the part of the House repeatedly refused to recede. There can be no doubt as to the intent of the Congress nor can there be any doubt as to the express language of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 that most-favored-nation treatment shall not be accorded to Poland and Yugoslavia, neither of which nations is a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I compliment the gentleman on his forthright statement and join with him in his strong insistence that the President of the United States take all necessary steps to carry into effect this language of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and I might go further and say this mandate, for that is what it is, of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

May I say in conclusion that having to arise to make this statement on the floor of the House is not a task that I have enjoyed. First of all, I am very reluctant to have to scold the President, as I have had to do in this instance. Secondly, it was my privilege to visit Poland and Yugoslavia, particularly Yugoslavia, shortly after it disaffiliated with Communist Russia. I was assured by them that they were going to work directly into the orbit of the free nations of the world. Certainly I think they have failed to do that. Much of the assistance that we have given them has met with a very unappreciative response on their part.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman. I think he has made a very accurate and forthright speech today. I have in mind that in last Sunday's paper, there was an article which indicated that Tito and the Kremlin are getting very much closer together again. In my opinion, our hopes of drawing Yugoslavia out of the Communist orbit has been futile. I also would like to indicate the recollection I have that our Secretary of State last year in

testifying on the export control act did indicate very definitely the position of our administration, that Poland is in the Communist bloc and I think the gentleman in saying what he has said today has made a very valuable contribution toward what our policy should be and I compliment him.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman. I would just like to say in conclusion that over my desk this morning there came a report from the Secretary of Commerce entitled "Export Control." This is a very elaborate presentation on the subject of export control. I would like and appreciate very much if a similar attention would be given to import control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman has expired.

WHY CAN'T THE BRITISH FIGHT COMMUNISM IN THIS HEMISPHERE TOO?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people would like to know.

In the past 6 weeks a total of nine British merchant vessels representing some 120,000 gross tons put into Cuba. Thus it is business as usual for our partner in the Anglo-American alliance, as British trade with Communist Cuba continues.

A number of our allies have suspended their practice of allowing merchant vessels to aid the Soviets in Cuba. They have cooperated because their allegiance to the free world means more to them than the few rubles which come from the cargo runs between Russia and Cuba.

But the principal offender; namely, our ally Great Britain, seems to value rubles more than American friendship.

Hopefully, British trade with Cuba will just come to a quiet end. But signs seem to be in the other direction. The British shipowners association is reported by United Press International today as being wholly opposed to the U.S. position against allied shipping to Cuba. This association, known as the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, did concede that the temporary interruption of the British cargo runs to Cuba during the October missile crisis was, in their words, "readily understandable."

Mr. Speaker, relations with Cuba have not improved one iota since last October. In fact, they have worsened. Is the British shipping industry unable to sense the inroads of communism in this part of the world, and its continuing contribution to it?

I urge that the United States close its seaports to all nations which allow their flags flown in commerce with Cuba.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.